

## **REMARKS**

### **A.     Objection to Disclosure**

In the Office Action mailed on April 22, 2005, the specification was objected to for using reference characters that do not correspond to those in the drawings. In view of the present proposed Amendments to the Drawings, the reference characters in the specification match those in the proposed amended drawings. Accordingly, the objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

### **B.     Objection to Drawings**

The drawings were objected to for using reference characters that do not correspond to those in the specification. In view of the present proposed Amendments to the Drawings, the reference characters in the specification match those in the proposed amended drawings. Accordingly, the objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

The drawings were also objected to for failing to label the boxes in the figures. In view of the present proposed Amendments to the Drawings, the boxes in the figures have been labeled. Accordingly, the objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

### **C.     35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

Claims 1-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for being indefinite. In particular, claim 1 was rejected because the term “rpm regulator” was unclear in meaning. Applicants traverse the rejection in that one of ordinary skill would understand the term to refer to a speed regulator. Despite the impropriety of the rejection, the term “rpm” has been replaced throughout the claims with “speed.” Since the meaning of “speed regulator” is well understood, the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 3 was rejected because it was unclear which “said integral component” is being referred to. Applicants traverse this rejection in that the term “said integral component” refers to the term “integral component” first mentioned in claim 1. The recited “second integral component” is separate and distinct from the recited “said integral component.” Since the terms are clear in meaning, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 6 was rejected because the term DT1 was unclear in meaning. Applicants traverse this rejection in that the term is defined in Applicants’ specification as a first order delay time member. Despite the improperness of the rejection, the term DT1 has been replaced by first order delay time-member throughout the claims.

Claim 8 was rejected because the term PT2 was unclear in meaning. Applicants traverse this rejection in that the term is defined in Applicants’ specification as a second order delay time member. Despite the improperness of the rejection, the term PT2 has been replaced by second order delay time-member throughout the claims.

Claim 12 was rejected because the term PT1 was unclear in meaning. Applicants traverse this rejection in that the term is defined in Applicants’ specification as a delay member. Despite the improperness of the rejection, the term PT1 has been replaced by delay member throughout the claims.

Claim 12 was also rejected because it was unclear where the output of the DT1 member was being supplied. Applicants traverse this rejection in that the claim clearly states that the output “is supplied . . . to a branch of said nominal speed conducted on said integral component of said speed regulator.” Accordingly, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Claim 17 was rejected because it was unclear what the nominal rpm was conducted over.

Applicants traverse this rejection in that claim 12, as amended, is clear that the nominal speed is conducted over a reference model. An example of this is shown in the embodiment shown in FIG. 3. Since the claim is clear in meaning, the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn.

Please note that claim 1-18 have been amended to change one or more of the phrases/terms “rpm,” “DT1,” “PT2,” “PT1” with “speed.” “first order delay time-member,” “second order delay time-member” and “delay member,” respectively, throughout the claims. Since such changes do not change the intended meaning or scope of the claims, the amendments are not related to patentability as defined in *Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.*, 234 F.3d 558, 56 USPQ2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (*en banc*), *overruled in part*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002).

**C. 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being obvious in view of Norris et al. Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the speed regulator generates “a nominal current based on a difference between a nominal speed and an actual speed.” In contrast, Norris et al.’s controller 30 subtracts velocity signals 75a, 77b from velocity signals 77d and 77c as shown in Fig. 6. The velocity signals 77c, 77d represent gross velocity motions of the beam 22 (Col. 13, ll. 40-43) and velocity signals 75a, 75b represent gross velocity motions at the locations of the sensors 26c, 26d. There is no suggestion in Norris et al. to use a nominal speed as part of the difference formed between signals 75a, b and 77c, d. Accordingly, the rejection is overcome and the rejection should be withdrawn.

**D. Claims 2 and 4-18**


Applicants note with appreciation that claims 2 and 4-18 have been indicated to contain allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claims 2 and 5 have been amended so as to be in independent form. Thus, claims 2 and 4-18 should be allowed.

As pointed out above, claims 2 and 5 have been amended so as to be in independent form. Since the amendments incorporate elements that were inherently present in the claims, the amendments are not related to patentability. *See, Festo Corporation v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd*, 535 U.S. 722 (2002).

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the arguments above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims 1-18 are in condition for allowance and seek an early allowance thereof. If for any reason, the Examiner is unable to allow the application in the next Office Action and believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any remaining issues, he is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorneys at (312) 321-4200.

Respectfully submitted,



John C. Freeman  
Registration No. 34,483  
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER  
GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. Box 10395  
Chicago, Illinois 60610  
(312) 321-4200

Dated: August 22, 2005

**In the Drawings:**

Applicants are submitting proposed corrections for Figures 1-3. The present proposed amendment adds labels to the boxes and changes the reference characters so that they match the reference characters used in the description.

The additions have been indicated in red ink. Furthermore, it is not believed that the corrections involve new matter. Accordingly, please indicate whether the corrections are acceptable in the next Office Action.

FIG. 1

1/2




FIG. 2




FIG. 3

